Appl. No. 10/675,797

Amdt. Dated February 27, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 27, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81864.0026

Customer No.: 26021

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action

dated November 27, 2006. Claims 1-6 remain in this application. Claim 1 is the

independent Claim. It is believed that no new matter is involved in the arguments

presented herein. Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the

application are respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action noted that the Information Disclosure Statement

submission dated July 19, 2006 does not include a concise explanation of the

relevance of Chinese Patent Document No. 1,258,082 A, which corresponds to EP

1014 392 A2. In response, Applicant provides the following explanation and is

concurrently submitting a copy of the above reference (EP 1014 392 A2) with the

present submission.

In Claim 1, the amounts of Al and Cu are defined as being, "0.02% to 0.6% by

weight of Al and/or Cu." In contrast, in the examples of EP 1014 392 A2 (Chinese

Patent Document No. 1,258,082 A), the total amounts of Al and Cu are as follows:

Page 2 of 5

Appl. No. 10/675,797 Amdt. Dated February 27, 2007 Reply to Office Action of November 27, 2006

Attorney	Docket No.	8186	4.0026
	Customer	No.:	26021

	Amount of Al	Amount of Cu	Total Amount of Al
	(wt%)	(wt%)	and Cu (wt%)
Example 1 and	0.5	0.2	0.7
Comparative Example 1			
Example 2 and	0.8	0.1	0.9
Comparative Example 2			
Example 3 and	0.7	0.1	0.8
Comparative Example 3			
Example 4 and	0.6	0.1	0.7
Comparative Example 4			

Accordingly, EP 1014 392 A2 (Chinese Patent Document No. 1,258,082 A) and the present application are different in the amounts of Al and Cu.

In Claim 3, a suitable sintering temperature range is 40°C or more. In contrast, EP 1014 392 A2 does not mention such a broad suitable sintering temperature range. Recordation and consideration of that document are respectfully requested.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1-6 were provisionally rejected under 35 USC § 101 over Claims 1-3 and 6 of copending Application No. 10/799,243; Claims 1-6 were provisionally rejected under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-6 of copending Application No. 10/799,243; Claims 1-6 were rejected under obviousness-type double patenting over the Claims of copending Application No. 10/799,243 and 10/675,230 each in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,595,608 (Takebuchi); Claims 1-6 were rejected under obviousness-type double patenting over the Claims U.S. Patent No. 6,811,620 in view of Takebuchi.

Appl. No. 10/675,797

Amdt. Dated February 27, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 27, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81864.0026

Customer No.: 26021

Regarding the statutory double patenting rejection, claim 1 in copending

Application No. 10/799,243 will be amended, rendering that rejection moot.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 1-6, Applicant is concurrently submitting

a Statement of Common Ownership and Terminal Disclaimer between the present

application and copending Application No. 10/799,243, 10/799,153, 10/675,230 and

U.S. Patent No. 6,811,620. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-6 are moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejection are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance

and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The remaining claims depend either directly from independent Claim 1, and

recite additional features of the invention and are therefore also believed to be in

condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in

condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as

amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition

for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los

Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4721 to discuss the steps necessary

for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Page 4 of 5

Appl. No. 10/675,797

Amdt. Dated February 27, 2007

Reply to Office Action of November 27, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81864.0026 Customer No.: 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

By:

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: February 27, 2007

Dariush G. Adli

Registration No. 51,386 Attorney for Applicant(s)

 $1999 \ \mathrm{Avenue} \ \mathrm{of} \ \mathrm{the} \ \mathrm{Stars}, \ \mathrm{Suite} \ 1400$

Los Angeles, California 90067

Phone: 310-785-4600 Fax: 310-785-4601